



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,693	05/15/2001	Kazuhisa Fushihara	0020-4864P	8117

2292 7590 10/21/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

GORDON, RAEANN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

124

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/854,693

Applicant(s)

FUSHIHARA, KAZUHIISA

Examiner

Raeann Gorden

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimasa et al (JP 06-327791). Yoshimasa discloses a golf ball for water surface training comprising a core and a cover. The cover is made from an ionomer resin having a flexural modulus from 1500 to 3000 kg/cm² or 147 to 294 Mpa. The golf ball has a specific gravity from 0.5 to 1.0 (abstract). Applicant further claims the ratio (F/D) wherein F is the flexural modulus of the cover and D is the deformation of the golf ball. Applicant provides data for the Yoshimasa patent showing a F/D ratio from 36 to 98. Applicant's claimed F/D ratio is from 24 to 31 and the disclosed value is from 15 to 50 (spec 4). Therefore the F/D value is an obvious modification since applicant clearly discloses the range taught by Yoshimasa and does not teach away from the range. Furthermore, Yoshimasa and the present invention disclose identical materials for the core and cover layer. The cores are made from polybutadiene BR11, VCR412, Mipelon XM-220, Nipol 2007J, zinc oxide, hollow particles, methacrylic acid, and dicumyl peroxide. See table 1 of spec; pages 2-3 and tables 1-2 of the Yoshimasa translation. The covers have the same flexural modulus and are made from Himilan 1605, 1705,

Art Unit: 3711

1706 and 1855. See table 3 of spec; page 3 of the Yoshimasa translation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the invention of Yoshimasa by lowering the F/D ratio to achieve the desired golf ball properties.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8-4-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The 102 rejection over Yoshimasa is withdrawn. However, a new 103 rejection has been implemented as shown above. As shown above the present invention and the Yoshimasa reference disclose identical core and cover compositions. Applicant states the ratio F/D of Yoshimasa equals 44.3 to 115.7, which is outside applicant's claimed range of 24 to 31. However, applicant discloses a F/D range from 15 to 50 (spec page 4). Therefore the F/D value is an obvious modification since applicant clearly discloses the range taught by Yoshimasa and does not teach away from the range.

The Examiner has furnished applicant with a copy of the foreign and translated versions of the Yoshimasa reference. However, the tables are not translated. If available, applicant is requested to provide the Examiner with a translated version of the entire reference.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 703-308-8354. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.



Raeann Gorden
Examiner
Art Unit 3711

RG
October 20, 2003